

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending and stand rejected. Claim 1 is amended by way of this amendment to clarify the subject matter of the invention. All pending claims, as amended, are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Specification

The undersigned acknowledges that the specification contains no no Summary of the Invention. However, it is believed that the Summary of the Invention is not required as both 37 CFR 1.73 and MPEP 608.01(d) use the term “should” rather than “must” in connection with the Summary of the Invention. Thus it is believed that Amendment to the Specification is not required.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, namely the term “medium.” The specification is amended at paragraph [0032] to recite the term “medium.”

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 6-10, 14, 18, 21, 26, 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cranor et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,100).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method that generally includes processing network traffic using a first program containing a first interface instance having a first behavior, detecting a first condition, generating a second program containing a second interface instance having a second behavior, the generation including selecting the second interface instance from a plurality of interface instances and loading the second program for use in processing network traffic, and processing network traffic using the second program.

Independent claim 18 recites a system that generally includes a network processor having a processing core, microengine(s), and a memory unit that includes code that is operable to cause the network processor to detect a first condition, identify a first instance of a first interface suitable for handling the first condition, select the first instance of the first interface from a plurality of instances of the first interface, generate a code image that includes the first instance

of the first interface, and load the code image into one or more of the microengine(s) for execution.

Independent claim 26 recites a system that generally includes a switch fabric and one or more that cards that have physical layer component(s); one or more network processors, at least one of which has a processing core, microengine(s), a memory unit similar to that recited in independent claim 18.

In contrast, Cranor discloses a system for monitoring traffic in which the FTAs are already loaded prior to the system performs any packet processing. For example, in step 201 shown in FIG. 2, “the run-time system 120 allocates and initializes the various instances of the FTA blocks 131 . . . 133.” (Col. 3, lines 34-36.) Next, “At step 202, the run-time system 120 receives a packet and performs some initial processing of the packet, . . .” (Col. 3, lines 30-41).

In other words, Cranor does not load any additional FTA’s into the system once the run-time system 120 begins processing packets at step 202 (FIG. 2). The claims, on the other hand, explicitly recites that, once packing processing begins, a second program is not only selected but also loaded for use in processing network traffic.

Thus Cranor does not disclose or suggest the inventions as claimed

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims independent claim 1, 18, and 26 as well as claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranor et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,100), and further in view of Knudsen (“LEGO Mindstorms Robots”). In addition, claims 3-5, 16, 19-20, 24-25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranor et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,100), and further in view of Liberty (“Sams Teach Yourself C++ in 10 Minutes”).

However, claims 2-5, 16, 19-20, 22, 24-25 and 27 are believed to be allowable at least because the independent claims from which they variously depend are believed to be allowable as discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13, 15, 17 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cranor et al. (U.S. Patent 7,165,100).

However, claims 11-13 are believed to be allowable at least because the independent claims from which they variously depend are believed to be allowable as discussed above.

Independent claim 15, as amended, recites a computer program package that generally includes instructions that cause the processor to obtain an identification of a selected implementation of a first interface, obtain a first code image containing the selected implementation of the first interface and one or more other implementations of the first interface, and generate a second code image by removing the one or more other implementations of the first interface from the first code image and loading the second code image for use in processing network traffic.

Independent claim 23, as amended, recites a method for performing dynamic resource adaptation that generally includes identifying a selected interface implementation, removing one or more other interface implementations from a first code image to form a second code image that includes the selected interface implementation, loading the second code image, and using the second code image to perform one or more network processing tasks.

As noted above, Cranor discloses a system for monitoring traffic in which the FTAs are already loaded prior to the system performs any packet processing. For example, in step 201 shown in FIG. 2, “the run-time system 120 allocates and initializes the various instances of the FTA blocks 131 . . . 133.” (Col. 3, lines 34-36.) Next, “At step 202, the run-time system 120 receives a packet and performs some initial processing of the packet, . . .” (Col. 3, lines 30-41).

In other words, Cranor does not load any additional FTA’s into the system once the run-time system 120 begins processing packets at step 202 (FIG. 2). The claims, on the other hand, explicitly recites that, once packing processing begins, a second program is not only selected but also loaded for use in processing network traffic.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-13, 15, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a

telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **50-1217** (Order No. **INTCP006**).

Respectfully submitted,



Jung-hua Kuo
Reg. No. 41,918
P.O. Box 3275
Los Altos, CA 94024
Telephone: (650) 988-8070
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090